

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending.

In paragraph No. 4 of the Action, Claims 1-8, 11 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Igaki et al (US 7,026,654, "Igaki") in view of Inganas et al (US 6,966,997, "Inganas").

Applicants submit that this rejection should be withdrawn because Igaki and Inganas do not disclose or render obvious the present invention, either alone or in combination.

Igaki discloses a package for an optical semiconductor having a light-emitting device and a light-receiving device in one package, in which a groove is provided between the light-emitting device and the light-receiving device to thereby avoid rays of light from the light-emitting device to directly enter the light-receiving device (abstract and col. 2, lines 28-37).

The Examiner contends that Igaki differs from the claimed invention in that Igaki does not explicitly disclose that the photo-conductive organic semiconductor or the electroluminescent organic semiconductor is a polymer semiconductor. Inganas is relied upon for making up for the deficiencies of Igaki.

Inganas discloses that a film made from poly(3,4-dioxoethylenethiophene) (PEDOT) has very attractive properties for polymer electronic devices because it enhances the stability and efficiency of the devices (col. 6, lines 4-13).

However, Igaki does not teach or suggest the structures of the light-emitting device or the light-receiving device.

Accordingly, Igaki does not teach or suggest "a light sensing unit having *a layer including a photo-conductive organic semiconductor*" or "a light emitting unit having *a layer*

including an electroluminescent organic semiconductor” as recited in present Claims 1, 11 and

12. Inganas does not make up for the deficiencies of Igaki.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the §103(a) rejection of Claims 1-8, 11 and 12 based on Igaki in view of Inganas are respectfully requested.

In paragraph No. 7 of the Action, Claims 9 and 10 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but have been indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

Applicants submit that Claims 9 and 10 are patentable in their present form because Claims 1-3 are patentable over the references, as discussed above.

Allowance is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



Hui C. Wauters
Registration No. 57,426

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: September 17, 2008